



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,745	01/17/2002	Elad Barkan	P-9485-US	2529
7590	02/09/2007		EXAMINER	
Eitan Law Group C/O LandonIP, Inc. Suite 450 1700 Diagonal Road Alexandria, VA 22314			PERUNGA VOOR, VENKATANARAY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/046,745	BARKAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Venkat Perungavoor	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 2-7, filed 12/12/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 14-28 under 35 USC § 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U.S Patent 5745574 to Muftic.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-19, 21-24, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5604804 to Micali in view of U.S Patent 5745574 to Muftic.

Regarding Claim 14, 22, Micali discloses the implementing in device a document issuing policy of the CA see Col 2 Ln 17-31; reading into device a certified document associated with user see Col 3 Ln 13-28; generating of behalf of CA a new certified document based on read document see Col 6 Ln 14-26. Although Micali discloses the certificate being generated on behalf of CA, it more clearly expressed by Muftic see Fig. 16 item 1620. Where the certificate for subordinate CA is generated and whenceforth the subordinate CA has full authority to act as the parent CA. It would be obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include certificate being generated on behalf of CA in the invention of Micali in order to delegate authority and responsibilities as taught in Muftic see Fig. 1A.

Regarding Claim 15, Micali discloses the identity of device in form of digital signature stored with intermediate CA see Col 4 Ln 18-42.

Regarding Claim 16, 24, Micali discloses the policy attests to personal identifying information of user see Col 6 Ln 28-39.

Regarding Claim 17, Micali discloses the certified document being output thorough a secure channel see Col 5 Ln 20-36.

Regarding Claim 18, Micali discloses the digital documents being certificates and permits see Col 5 Ln 37-45.

Regarding Claim 19 and 21, 26, Micali discloses the signing of certificates and authorities along the path see Col 6 Ln 14-26.

Claims 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5604804 to Micali in view of U.S Patent 5872848 to Romney et al. further in view of U.S Patent 5745574 to Muftic.

Regarding Claim 20 and 25, Micali does not disclose the biometric unit being used. However, Romney discloses the biometric unit being used see Fig. 2 item 250. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the biometric unit in the invention of Micali in order to provide for additional security feature to document.

Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5604804 to Micali in view of U.S. Patent 5721781 to Deo further in view of U.S. Patent 5745574 to Muftic.

Regarding Claim 27 and 28, Micali does not disclose the wristwatch and smart card device. However, Deo discloses the wristwatch and smart card device see Col 4 Ln 21-35. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the wristwatch and smart card device in the invention of Micali in order to use conventional electronics.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Venkat Perungavoor whose telephone number is 571-272-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00. If attempts to reach

Art Unit: 2132

the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Venkat Perungavoor
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

vp
2/3/2007

Gilberto Barron
GILBERTO BARRON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100